UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,738	12/21/2001	Jeffrey B. Norton	16159.039001; P7221	3707

32615   7590   10/04/2004

OSHA & MAY L.L.P./SUN
1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER
NAHAR, QAMRUN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2124	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 December 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *21 December 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12/21/01*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-28 have been examined.

Specification

2.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: "Field of Invention"

section is missing on page 1 of the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.   Claims 1-7, 11 and 16-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Song (U.S. 5,949,999).

Per Claim 1:

The Song patent discloses:

- a method for generating a software development tool ("The present invention is a

mechanism that integrates software engineering and system components to guide the

browsing/tracking of software development documents (e.g., requirement, design, testing, etc.)

and their relationships." in column 1, lines 38-42)

**- creating a definition file defining an action to be performed by the software development
tool** ("The system contains a procedure definition which defines the software development
procedure." in column 1, lines 47-48)

**- creating a schema defining characteristics of a plurality of desired inputs for the software
development tool** ("An interface allows users to select phase, activity, and system components
and execute other utility programs or choose options." in column 1, lines 48-50)

**- creating a resource file comprising information required by the software development
tool at runtime; and generating the software development tool using the definition file, the
schema, and the resource file** ("A browser interpreter interprets the selection and decides how
to form and execute each command. ... A project file contains the information about system
components, physical locations of the system documents, documentation tools associated with
documents, options selected, hyper-links to the documents, etc" in column 1, lines 50-52 and
lines 55-59).

Per Claim 2:

The Song patent discloses:

**- further comprising: creating a command list comprising a set of commands that are used
to define the action** (column 1, lines 52-55).

Per Claim 3:

The Song patent discloses:

**- further comprising: generating an annotation defining custom characteristics of a user
interface of the software development tool using the schema** (column 4, lines 5-13 and lines
28-35).

Per Claim 4:

The Song patent discloses:

**- further comprising: creating an annotation defining semantics of a graphical user
interface of the software development tool, wherein the annotation is used with the
definition file, the schema, and the resource file to generate the software development tool**
(column 4, lines 5-13 and lines 28-35).

Per Claim 5:

The Song patent discloses:

**- wherein the definition file further comprises references to the schema and the resource
file** (column 5, lines 1-42).

Per Claim 6:

> The Song patent discloses:

- wherein the definition file further comprises references to the schema, the resource file, and the command list (column 5, lines 1-42).

Per Claim 7:

> The Song patent discloses:

- wherein the definition file further comprises references to the schema, the resource file, and the annotation (column 5, lines 1-42).

Per Claim 11:

> The Song patent discloses:

- wherein the command list comprises a transform command (column 1, lines 52-55).

Per Claim 16:

> The Song patent discloses:

- wherein the action comprises commands (column 1, lines 52-55).

Per Claim 17:

The Song patent discloses:

- wherein the software development tool is generated using a software development tool generator (column 5, lines 1-42).

Per Claim 18:

The Song patent discloses:

- wherein the software development tool generator is integrated within an Integrated Development Environment (column 5, lines 1-42).

Per Claim 19:

The Song patent discloses:

- wherein the software development tool is integrated within an Integrated Development Environment (column 5, lines 1-42).

Per Claim 20:

This is another version of the claimed method discussed above (claims 1, 2 and 3), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Song.

Per Claim 21:

This is another version of the claimed method discussed above (claims 1, 2 and 4),

wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth

above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Song.

Per Claims 22 and 24:

These are computer-readable medium versions of the claimed method discussed above

(claims 1 and 4, respectively), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or

covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by

Song.

Per Claim 23:

This is a computer-readable medium version of the claimed method discussed above

(claims 2 and 3), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited

areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Song.

Per Claim 25:

This is a computer system version of the claimed method discussed above (claims 1, 2

and 3), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as

set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Song.

Per Claim 26:

This is a computer system version of the claimed method discussed above (claims 1, 2 and 4), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Song.

Per Claim 27:

This is an apparatus version of the claimed method discussed above (claims 1, 2 and 3), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Song.

Per Claim 28:

This is an apparatus version of the claimed method discussed above (claims 1, 2 and 4), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Song.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 8-10 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song (U.S. 5,949,999) in view of Lipkin (U.S. 6,721,747).

Per Claim 8:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Song does not explicitly teach wherein the definition file comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document. Lipkin teaches wherein the definition file comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document (column 49, lines 60-67).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Song to include wherein the definition file comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document using the teaching of Lipkin. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide users more flexibility with the customization of a document.

Per Claim 9:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Song does not explicitly teach wherein the schema comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document. Lipkin teaches wherein the schema comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document (column 49, lines 50-54).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Song to include wherein the schema comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document using the teaching of Lipkin. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide users more flexibility in customization.

Per Claim 10:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Song does not explicitly teach wherein the resource file comprises an Extensible Stylesheet Language document. Lipkin teaches wherein the resource file comprises an Extensible Stylesheet Language document (column 50, lines 4-7).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Song to include wherein the resource file comprises an Extensible Stylesheet Language document using the teaching of Lipkin. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide users more flexibility with the customization of a document.

Per Claim 12:

The rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and further, Song does not explicitly teach wherein the transform command initiates an Extensible Stylesheet Language processor. Lipkin teaches wherein the transform command initiates an Extensible Stylesheet Language processor (column 51, lines 52-58 and column 52, lines 25-33).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Song to include wherein the transform command initiates an Extensible Stylesheet Language processor using the teaching of Lipkin. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide users more flexibility with the customization of a document.

Per Claim 13:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Song does not explicitly teach wherein the annotation comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document. Lipkin teaches wherein the annotation comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document (column 52, lines 7-19).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Song to include wherein the annotation comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document using the teaching of Lipkin. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide users more flexibility with the customization of a document.

Per Claim 14:

The rejection of claim 3 is incorporated, and further, Song does not explicitly teach wherein data obtained by the user interface is stored as metadata. Lipkin teaches wherein data obtained by the user interface is stored as metadata (column 2, lines 34-40).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Song to include wherein data obtained by the user interface is stored as metadata using the teaching of Lipkin. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to search for and discover information in a more flexible manner.

Per Claim 15:

The rejection of claim 14 is incorporated, and Lipkin further teaches wherein metadata

comprises an Extensible Mark-up Language document (column 51, lines 52-58).

Conclusion

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to

Qamrun Nahar whose telephone number is (703) 305-7699 *if calling before October 28, 2004;*

otherwise *if calling on or after October 28, 2004*, then the telephone number is (571)272-3730.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Thursdays from 9:00 AM to 6:30

PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kakali Chaki, can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or processing is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

QN
September 28, 2004

KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100